

REMARKS

Applicants file this Supplemental Amendment to replace the Amendment mailed earlier in response to the October 16, 2007 Office Action to correct a mistake in the Amendment to the claims. Please disregard the earlier filed Amendment.

Reconsideration of the above-referenced application is respectively requested in view of the above amendments and these remarks. Claims 1-13 and 16-20 are currently pending. Claims 14 and 15 are cancelled without prejudice.

The title to the invention has been objected to as being non-descriptive. Applicants have amended the title to A Method and Apparatus for Controlling Persistent Connections between a Proxy and a Server. Applicants respectfully submit that this title is directed to the invention and requests that the objection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 7-9 and 11-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,314,108 to Ramasubramani et al. Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 9 and 13 and certain independent claims to clarify the claimed invention and to obviate the rejection. Claims 14 and 15 have been cancelled. In particular, independent claims 1, 9 and 13 have been amended to indicate that the persistent connections are between the proxy and the one or more servers to which the requests for an object are directed.

According to the claimed invention, users send requests to a proxy for an object on one or more servers. The proxy sends the requests for an object to the server. The main focus of the claimed invention is the control of the persistent connections between the proxy and the one or more server. The proxy controls the communications over the persistent connections. The proxy controls allocating of requests to the plurality of persistent connections for transmission to the servers, receiving the requested objects from the servers over the persistent connections and ordering delivery of the objects to the users.

Ramasubramani is directed to a centralized network access for wireless network carriers providing network access to wireless communication devices. Ramasubramani provides a network gateway, or proxy server, that provides access to a network of computers to various wireless network carriers having different wireless characteristics

and uses airlinks to support the communication between the network gateway and the wireless network carriers. As the Ramasubramani focuses on the airlinks between the proxy and the wireless network carriers, it is focusing on the connections between the proxy and the users. Ramasubramani does not focus on or provide any information on the persistent connections between the proxy and the servers that supply the objects requested by the users. Applicants have amended the claims so that the claims focus on the connection between the proxy and the servers and not the proxy and the user.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that Ramasubramani does not disclose the claimed apparatus, system and method that focuses on the persistent connections between the proxy and the one or more servers on which requested objects are. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 8 and 13 are not anticipated by Ramasubramani. As claims 2, 4-5 and 7 depend on claim 1, claims 9 and 11-12 depend on claim 8 and claims 16-20 depend on claim 13, Applicants submit that these claims are not anticipated by the cited reference for the same reasons. Applicants request that the rejection under Section 102(b) be withdrawn.

Claims 3, 6 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ramasubramani in view of United States Patent No. 7,167,926 to Boucher et al. Claims 3 and 6 depend on claim 1 and claim 10 depends on claim 8. Applicants respectfully submit the dependent claims are patentable over the cited combination as neither Ramasubramani nor Boucher are directed to the persistent connections between the proxy and the servers on which objects are for the reasons given above with respect to the rejection under Section 102(b). Applicants request that the rejection under Section 103(a) be withdrawn.

As the Applicants have overcome all substantive rejections and objections given by the Examiner and have complied with all requests properly presented by the Examiner, the Applicants contend that this Amendment, with the above discussion, overcomes the Examiner's objections to and rejections of the pending claims. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of the application. If the Examiner is of the opinion that any issues regarding the status of the claims remain after this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned representative to expedite resolution of the matter.

Serial No.10/840,053

Bedekar et al

Case No. CE10624R

Please charge any fees associated herewith, including extension of time fees, to
50-2117.

Respectfully submitted,
Bedekar, Anand S., et al.

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.
Law Department

Customer Number: **22917**

By: /Simon B. Anolick/

Simon B. Anolick

Attorney for Applicant

Registration No.: 37,585

Telephone: 847-576-4234

Fax: 847-576-3750